"The Truth shall make you FREE."—Christ.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 8.] AUGUST, 1860. [Price 1½d.

DR. JOSEPH PRIESTLEY.

"THE MEMORY OF THE JUST IS BLESSED."

Oxford has done honour to a name that waneth not as years roll on—the name of Priestley; and ages hence will love and bless his memory still more, because they will understand his greatness still better. Joseph Priestley was a christian man and a scholar, an ardent toiler for truth and liberty, of whom we have great reason to be proud; and it is well for both youth and age occasionally to visit the shrine of so illustrious a one in virtue and learning, and drink the cool and living water that flows from the fount of his memory; it will refresh our hearts, and strengthen our hands to do the work of our lot in patience and faith, and in cheerful trust in the living God.

Joseph Priestley was born at Birstal, near Leeds, on the 13th of March, 1733. His mother died when he was six years old. It appears they were a Presbyterian family. He says, "It is but little I can recollect of my mother. I remember, however, that she was careful to teach me the Assembly's Catechism, and to give me the best moral instruction. Once, in particular, when I was playing with a pin, she asked me where I got it; and on telling her I found it at my uncle's, who lived very near, and where I had been playing with my cousins, she made me carry it back again, no doubt to impress my mind, as it could not fail to do, with a clear idea of the distinction of property, and of the importance of attending to it." How well it is, at an early age, to impress children with lessons of what is right, even in the case of a pin. It is no small thing to the honour of that mother, that her son had this feature of her before his memory. She died in the hard winter of 1739, having dreamed, a little before her death, that she was in a delightful place, which she particularly described, and imagined to be heaven. The last words she spake were, "Let me go to that fine place." Joseph was staying with an uncle at the time of his mother's death. His father then took him home, but he was soon after taken by an aunt, very well to do in the world, a Mrs. Keighly, who educated him. He says, "Looking back, as I often do on this period of my life, I see the greatest reason to be thankful to God for the pious care of my parents and friends in giving me religious instruction. My mother was a woman of exemplary piety; and my father also had a strong sense of religion, praying with his family, morning and evening, and carefully teaching his children and servants the Assembly's Catechism, which was all the system of religion of which he had any knowledge. The same was the case with my excellent aunt; she was truly Calvinistic in principle, but was far from confining salvation to those who thought as she did, on religious subjects. Being left in good circumstances, her home was the resort of all the Dissenting ministers in the neighbourhood, without distinction; and those who were the most obnoxious, on account of their heresy (which would be Arminian), were almost as welcome to her as any others. Thus I was brought up with sentiments of piety, but without bigotry; and having from my earliest years given much attention to the subject of religion, I was as much confirmed as I well could be on the principles of Calvinism, all the books that came in my way having that tendency."

We now come to a distressful period of his life, which all must have who give a serious thought to the doctrines of Calvinism. "The weakness of my constitution" (he says) "which often led me to think that I should not be long-lived, gave me a more serious turn of mind. I read books of 'experiences,' and was led to believe that a new birth, by the immediate spirit of God, was necessary to salvation. I was not able to satisfy myself I had experienced anything of the kind. I had nothing to reproach myself with, yet I often concluded that God had forsaken me. I felt, occasionally, such distress of mind as it is not in my power to describe, and which I still look back upon with horror. I imagine that even these conflicts of mind were not without their use, as they led me to think habitually of God and a future state. The remembrance, however, of what I sometimes felt in that state of ignorance and darkness, gives me a peculiar sense of the value of rational principles of religion." He adds this very truthful and beautiful reflection on such seasons, and the absence of them: —"As truth, we cannot doubt, must have an advantage over error, we must conclude that the want of these peculiar feelings is compensated for by something of greater value, which arises to others, from having always seen things in a just and pleasing light,—from having always considered the Supreme Being as the kind parent of all his offspring. This, however, not having been my case, I cannot be so good a judge of the effects of it. At all events we ought always to inculcate just views of things, assuring ourselves that proper feelings and right conduct will be the consequence of them."

In the days of Priestley the grand controversy was between the Calvinists and Arminians. The former held the fixed fate of all mankind; the latter held the freedom of mankind to obey or disobey, to be received or cast off, as they resolved to be Christians or not. The Calvinists were the orthodox; the Arminians the heterodox. Arminianism has triumphed, and they are scarcely, even now, regarded as heretics by Calvinists. The present age makes Trinitarianism orthodoxy, and Unitarianism heterodoxy. We think heterodoxy will triumph again; and in less than one hundred years as great a change will come over the church of the future, as has done in the past.

One or two incidents in the life of Priestley will show the spirit of Dissenters one hundred years ago—how strongly Calvinistic; and we will also trace his progress from Calvinism to Unitarianism. He says (being about 18 years of age), "Before I went from home I was very desirous of being admitted a communicant in the congregation which I had always attended, and the old minister, as well as my aunt, were as desirous of it as myself; but the elders of the Church, who had the government of it, refused me because, when they questioned me on the 'Sin of Adam,' I appeared not to be quite orthodox; not thinking that all the human race (supposing them not to have any sin of their own) were liable to the wrath of God, and the pains of hell for ever, on account of that sin only. I well remember, being much distressed, that I could not feel a proper repentance for Adam's sin. Taking it for granted that, without this, it could not be forgiven me. Before I went from home to the academy I was an Arminian, but had by no means rejected the doctrine of the Trinity or Atonement." It was the intention of his friends that he should study at the Calvinistic Academy, Mile End, under Dr. Conder; but here there were ten Calvinistic articles of faith to sign, and he protested against going there. He was sent to study at Daventry, Dr. Doddridge's Academy; though the Dr. was dead before he went, it was still called after his name, and much more liberal than Academy's in those days. He was there until he was 22 years of age, was educated for a Nonconformist Minister, and acquired a sound education.

He says he had one great drawback as a preacher, and never got completely clear of it: "I was much discouraged with an impediment of speech, which I inherited from my family, and which still attends me; sometimes I absolutely stammered, and my anxiety about it was the cause of much distress to me. However, like St. Paul's thorn in the flesh, I hope it has not been without its use."

He visited London after he became a minister; one Mr. Angier professed to cure stammering; his aunt paid Mr. A. twenty guineas; he got a little good from this man. But while he was at Nantwich, he got so bad in stammering, he told the people he would have to give up preaching altogether, and confine himself to his school. They prevailed upon him to continue preaching. So by a practise of reading very loud and slow every day, he got a little better of it again. He never learned any music excepting while he boarded with Mr. Eddowes, when minister at Nantwich. "Mr. Eddowes was a very sociable and sensible man, and fond of music, so I learned to play a little on the flute, as the easiest instrument; and though I never was a proficient, my playing contributed more or less to my amusement, many years of my life." He recommends music, and it will be all the better, he thinks, if a person has not got a very fine ear or exquisite taste for it; like himself, they may be the more easily pleased by an indifferent performance. He was minister at Needham Market, then at Nantwich, and for some time a tutor at Warrington Academy.

The people at Needham soon found, and he found also, that he was an Arian. The first tract that he wrote was a renunciation of the doctrine of Atonement, or remission of sin. He soon became convinced that the doctrines of Christianity had become greatly corrupted, and prepared himself to write on this subject. Dr. Lardner was then living, whom he visited, to have his opinion on the way of conducting a work of this nature. Dr. Lardner was then 83 years of age. The kind and good old man reached down a bundle of papers, and handed Priestley a tract, saying, "This contains my sentiments on the subject;" and lo! it was a pamphlet that Priestley had written. Lardner said his memory had failed him of this. The reading of Dr. Lardner's work, in explanation of 1st chapter of John ("The Word made God"), made Priestley a Unitarian.

While he was at these three places we have named, he had a very small salary, and much to do to make ends meet, even by keeping a school. His aunt was either not very willing to support him any longer, from accounts she would hear of his heterodoxy, or she was not able, from having others to help. As it was, he had a hard struggle to keep up his position, and pay his way. He removed to Leeds, and was minister there several years. A number of his wealthy acquaintances perceiving his genius, subscribed a liberal sum of money annually, and gave it to him to enable him to carry on his investigations in philosophy. He was also aided by a few friends to pursue his inquiries on the corruptions of Christianity, and to publish them. He never became wealthy, although he had opportunities. God, he said, had taken more care of him, than ever he took care of himself, so far as money affairs were concerned. He was in all societies, from the highest to the lowest, as a companion and a friend, and used to make no scruple of maintaining, when the companion of the Earl of Shelburne, that there was most virtue, and most happiness, in the middle classes of life. The greatest part of the time he spent with Lord Shelburne, his lordship behaved to him with uniform politeness, and his guests with respect. "About two years," says Priestley, "before I left him, I perceived evident marks of dissatisfaction, though I never understood the cause of it. When I left him, I asked him whether he had any fault to find with my conduct; he said 'none.'"

We would briefly note the political character of Dr. Priestley; he lived in curious, difficult, and troublesome times, —the period of the first French Revolution, and the first American War, which were rabid King and Church days. He was what we would call an ultra-liberal in politics, indeed, a republican. His sympathies were with the French, in their first Revolution. He viewed the state of affairs in France with the utmost pleasure; it was the breaking up of a cruel despotism, and could not be done without a mighty stir. He was incredulous to the terrible atrocities committed by the republicans. He made himself very obnoxious, both in England and America, by the warmness of his adhesion to the republican party in France. In France they were mightily proud of Priestley. He had arisen to such eminence in letters and science,

that his name was known all over the world; and it was a great victory to know that they had Dr. Priestley, the philosopher and divine, of England, on their side. He was elected as a member to the Assembly, for one of the Departments, but refused the honour. He saw the proper end of all government, and affirmed what course politicians ought to pursue. He was a hater of corruption, time-serving, and place-hunting. He had no faith in the Divine Rights of Kings, or anybody else, to rule over others to their hurt. He denounced government interference with religion, and persecutions for conscience sake. He laid down the principles of true and just government, in several pamphlets, and entered into the defence of the people's rights, in all nations, to a share in the government. He sacrificed the intimate friendship of Edmund Burke, and others, for conscience sake. He was a patriot, a true patriot, a learned, noble, religious patriot. The great *Jeremy Bentham* says, "that it was by reading one of Dr. Priestley's political works he was enabled to lay down the basis on which he built all his renowned theories of government." Jeremy Bentham says, "*the only just purpose of government is the greatest happiness to the greatest number*,—a phrase for which, upwards of fifty years ago, I became indebted to a pamphlet of Dr. Priestley's." He was the intimate friend of Dr. Franklin, and no doubt they would indoctrinate each other with their ideas of government. During the American War Dr. Franklin, in his own peculiar way to Dr. Price, says he is glad to hear of the success of Dr. Priestley in his scientific experiments. "We make, daily, great improvements in natural,—here is one I wish to see in moral philosophy: the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats. When will human reason be sufficiently improved to see the advantage of this?"

We will briefly refer to the character and fame of Dr. Priestley, as a philosopher. He caused as much excitement, by his discoveries in science, among philosophers, as he caused agitation among theologians, by his attacks on the corruptions of theology. *Robert Hall* says he poured light into almost every department of science. *Bishop Horsley* said it was a most unfortunate thing that he should have hit upon such discoveries in science. He was made a member of the Royal Society, and received its gold medal. The President addressed the Society in these words:—"Gentlemen, It is with great satisfaction I confer, in your name, the prize medal of this Society, upon the Rev. Joseph Priestley, as best entitled to this public mark of your approbation, for his many curious and useful experiments." And addressing Priestley, he said, "It is now time that, in the name, and by the authority of the Royal Society of London, I present you with this medal, the palm and laurel of this community, of the just sense they have of your merit, in the way you have promoted the views and honour of the Society." Dr. Priestley is generally known as the discoverer of the constituent parts of air; until his time, air was regarded as a simple body. He was the first that analysed air, and demonstrated its two-fold parts. He was one of the greatest electricians of his age. How much we are at present indebted to his discoveries and experiments in electricity, learned men are willing to concede. The leading experimentalists in this science, Dr. Franklin, and others, felt their inferiority, and requested him to write his treatise on that subject.

He was instrumental in reviving the use of large electrical machines and batteries. These were mere playthings, he says, when I began my experiments. The Grand Duke of Tuscany sent over to Priestley to get him one of the best batteries in England. Priestley drew out the plan, and got one made, the largest and best that had been made, and sent it to him. While he was minister at Leeds, he was requested to accompany Captain Cook on his second voyage to the South Seas, as a philosopher. This fell through, owing to his heterodoxy in religion. "Having succeeded so well in electricity, I was induced," he says, "to undertake the history of all the branches of experimental philosophy. This work I executed to general satisfaction." *Brande* says, "In enumerating the higher merits of Dr. Priestley, as a discoverer,

we must not forget the minor advantages which his ingenuity bestowed upon experimental chemistry. He supplied the laboratory with many new and useful apparatus; and the improved methods of managing, collecting, and examining gaseous fluids, were chiefly the results of his experience." His fame, as a philosopher, had reached all classes. "While he was minister at Leeds, a poor woman unfortunately imagined herself to be possessed by a devil; and having heard that he was a great philosopher, she applied to him to take away the evil spirit that tormented her. He listened attentively to her statement, and being aware of her delusion, with his usual mildness and benevolence, endeavoured to convince her that she was labouring under a mistake. However, all his efforts proved unavailing, for the poor creature still persisted that the fact was as she stated; in order, therefore, to ease her mind, he, good humouredly, told her to call upon him the next day, and in the mean time he would consider her case. Agreeably to his request, the unhappy woman was punctual in her attendance, when, with a smile, he said that he truly pitied her situation, but hoped that he would be able to afford her some relief. His electrical apparatus being in readiness, with great gravity he desired the woman to stand upon the stool with glass legs, at the same time putting into her hand a brass chain connected with the conductor, and having charged her plentifully with electricity, he told her very seriously to take particular notice of what he did. He then took up a discharger and applied it to her arm, when the escape of the electricity gave her a pretty strong shock. 'There,' says she, 'the devil is gone; I saw him go in that blue flame, and he gave me such a jerk as he went off. I have at last got rid of him, and am now quite comfortable.'"

We have spoken of him as a politician and philosopher; amongst Unitarians he is most generally known as a theologian. We regard him as one of the clearest, yet most profound theologians the Christian church has ever seen. He said his chief delight was in theology, and in this sphere he showed giant intellect, and aroused the whole of the world's theologians by his writings. He conducted a controversy with several bishops, the most learned then in the world, with perfect success. He wrote replies to the writings of Paine and the slanders of Gibbon in a most masterly manner. His writings in defence of Revelation and Christianity are among the best of his works. His sermons are charged with strength and benevolence that excite inquiry and cherish goodwill. Paine raged against him like a madman, and Gibbon threatened to have an action at law against him for his attacks on his writings. He would found the action upon an Act of Parliament which was in force against Unitarians till 1813, and the sentence was death for preaching doctrines such as he held. He was a most devout student of the Holy Bible; he revered its pages. In his hours of sickness he delighted in having it read to him. On his voyage to America he read his Greek Testament all through as the book most worthy of his attention, though he knew its contents so well. He says: "The more attention I gave to the study of the Scripture the more attached I am to it; and I hope the time will come when I shall apply myself to it chiefly. At present, I read chiefly with a practical view, and the attentive consideration of the facts in the Gospel History has certainly the strongest tendency to impress the heart and influence the life in the most favourable manner. . . . . Other studies and other pursuits, that to many others are very proper and useful, appear to me to be altogether insignificant compared to these, *i. e.*, the study of the Bible."

His literary labours were immense, he wrote no less than one hundred and forty nine different and distinct works. Some of them were merely pamphlets, others were large volumes on Philosophy, History, Politics, Religion, and sundry other topics. He finished his last work a few minutes before he died.

Some may ask how he attended to his congregation in the midst of so much labour—philosophical, political, literary, and general business. He was a pattern to ministers. In his sermons he sought to improve the life of all his hearers, in his lessons and expositions of Scripture

to make clear the sense, in his worship so simple and child-like, in his attention to his chapel so faithful, and constant in his instruction of the children of his congregation. He had three classes every week. The children from six to twelve years of age he taught in simple stories and moral lessons. A Bible class for the more advanced. A class for young men and women above the age of sixteen. Nothing at the close of his life gave him more pleasing reflections than the time he had spent among children. Once being in company where it was affirmed that Christ never smiled or laughed, Priestley observed it was impossible that Christ could see the little children brought by their mothers, and take them up in his arms, without smiling upon so pleasant and beautiful a task. At home he was most affable, and kind with his family and servants. On one occasion a servant spoiled an experiment he had long been busy with. He went out and gave strict orders no one had to enter his laboratory. She thought she would be in, and dust all up the time he was out, and destroyed in a few minutes several weeks incessant labour. He spoke sorrowfully about it, but said it is well she did nothing worse, and readily forgave her. Sometimes he has been represented as an angry, disputatious man, and worse than all, a materialist and a necessarian. In different places of his work, he says, the common popular notions of free agency, that we can do what we will, are quite correct; in these views he believed. He was a materialist, *i.e.*, he said, man had a soul, and that his soul was something, was a substance—he called that a material soul, and it would rise at the resurrection. We do not see, eye to eye, with Priestley on two or three subjects. He may, after all, be right; we may be wrong; we should be careful not to shout a man down on a subject we know very little about. The substance of which a man's soul is made is a very fine subject to differ upon. He was anything but an angry, disputatious man. He knew how to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and did so at all seasons, and in all companies, and all countries. He could silence an Atheist, make a Deist think seriously, and knew the way to present and uphold primitive Christianity to be admired. He was a pleasant companion, a faithful husband, a kind father, and a good master. When very old he listened to a Dr. Ewing preach a very Calvinistic sermon, and some time after Priestley said to him, "Doctor, when I heard you preach, I felt quite young again." "How was that?" Dr. Ewing inquired. "Well, you talked Calvinism so pure, you reminded me of the kind of sermons I heard when a child. You made me feel quite young." That was scarcely like an angry man. Mrs. Priestley was once riding in a stage coach, and the conversation turned upon Dr. Priestley. One man said, among other bad things, he was a cruel monster to Mrs. Priestley. She said, after hearing all they had to say, when she was leaving the coach, "I am Mrs. Priestley; all you have said about my husband is utterly false. I wish every woman had such a husband." A thorough hater of the name of Priestley (for bitterness was bitter then) one night attending a friend's house met with him, and not knowing who it was, held conversation with him until midnight. He came early next morning to inquire who that intelligent and most pleasant gentleman was that he had been talking with last night. They laughed, and said it was Dr. Priestley, who was on a journey, and was gone. He said he could never forgive them if they had an opportunity of introducing him into his company again, at a future time, and did not do so. He never spent such a happy night in his life. Priestley's life fully accorded with this sentiment:—"To discover truth is, professedly, the aim of us all. Let us pursue the path that seems the most likely to lead to her abode, with ardour, but not with animosity; and if we be convinced that we have been happy enough to find it out, let us not insult those, who, in our estimation, may have been less successful." However much he laboured for the reformation of religion, he was accustomed to say that "a Christian spirit was of more value than Christian truth." Had this been attended to by his opponents, we should not have had this disgraceful chapter which follows.

To be continued.

WILL THE HEATHEN BE SAVED?

"If any of the heathen are saved, it will be an exception to the *general rule* in regard to them." Such is the opinion of Dr. Barnes, the commentator, in relation to the final condition of the heathen. Mr. Bush estimates that there are upward of four hundred and eighty millions of benighted heathen upon the earth at the present time. A missionary writing on this subject says, "Fifty thousand a day—so fast the heathen die! Fifty thousand every day go down to the fire that is not quenched. *Six hundred millions* more are going the same road. Think for at least one minute each day of the 50,000 who that day sink to the doom of the lost, and of the 600,000,000 more that are hastening to the same ruin of soul." An ingenious writer has estimated that according to this calculation, two thousand and eighty-four souls drop into hell every hour, thirty-five every minute, and one every two seconds. Remember that if the above theory is correct, the work goes steadily on; by day and by night, on week days and on Sabbath days, it is the same. There is no pause, no cessation, no rest. God's children are dropping into hell to endure an *eternity* of suffering at the rate of one every two seconds of time, for not complying with terms of which they never heard. Great God, can this be true? If so, then well might the condemned heathen exclaim:—

"Why burst the barriers of my peaceful grave?
Ah! cruel death! that would no longer save,
But grudg'd me e'en that narrow dark abode,
And cast me out into the wrath of God:

Where shrieks the roaring flame, the rattling chain,
And all the dreadful eloquence of pain,
Our only song; black fire's malignant light,
The sole refreshment of the blasted sight.

Must all those powers heaven gave me to supply
My soul with pleasure, and bring in my joy,
Rise up in arms against me, join the foe,
Sense, reason, memory, increase my woe?

And shall my voice, ordained on hymns to dwell,
Corrupt to groans, and blow the fires of hell?
Oh! must I look with terror on my gain,
And with existence only measure pain?

What! no reprieve, no less indulgence giv'n,
No beam of hope from any point of heaven!
Ah! mercy! mercy! art thou dead above?
Is love extinguished in the source of love?"

THE WIFE'S EXPERIMENT.

BY KATE CAMERON.

"Ma, why don't you dress up?" asked little Nellie Thornton, as her mother finished brushing the child's hair, and tying her clean apron. There was a momentary surprise on Mrs. Thornton's face, but she answered carelessly, "Oh, no one cares how I look."

"Don't *Pa* love to see you look pretty?" persisted the child. The mother did not reply, but involuntarily she glanced at her slovenly attire—the faded and worn calico dress and dingy apron, both bearing witness of an intimate acquaintance with the dish-pan and stove—the slip-shod shoes and soiled stockings—and she could not help remembering how she had that morning appeared with uncombed hair, and prepared her husband's breakfast before he left home for the neighbouring market town. "Sure enough," mused she, "how I do look!" And then memory pointed back a few years to a neatly and tastefully dressed maiden, sometimes busy in her father's house, again mingling with her young companions, but never untidy in her appearance—always fresh and blooming, and this she knew full well was a picture of herself when Charles Thornton first won her young heart. Such was the bride he had taken to his pleasant home.

She was still comely in features, graceful in form, but few would call her a handsome or an accomplished woman; for, alas! all other characteristics were overshadowed by this repulsive trait. Yet she loved to see others neat, and her house and children did not seem to belong to her, so well kept and tidy did they always look. As a housekeeper she excelled, and her husband was long in acknowledging to himself the unwelcome fact that he had married a sloven.

When, like too many other young wives, she began to grow negligent in regard to her dress, he readily excused her in his own mind, and thought, "she is not well," or "she has so much to do;" and perceiving no abatement in his kind attentions, she naturally concluded he was perfectly satisfied. As her family cares increased, and she went less into company, she became still more careless

of her personal appearance, and contented herself with seeing that nothing was lacking which could contribute to the comfort of her husband and children, never supposing that so trivial a matter as her own apparel could possibly affect their happiness. All this chain of circumstances hitherto unthought of passed before her, as the little prattler at her side repeated the query—"Don't Pa love to see you look pretty?"

"Yes, my child," she answered, and her resolve was taken—she would try an experiment, and prove whether Mr. Thornton was really indifferent on the subject or not. Giving Nellie a picture book to amuse herself, she went to her own room, mentally exclaiming, "at any rate, I'll never put on this rig again—not even washing-day." She proceeded to her clothes-press, and removed one dress after another; some were ragged, others faded, all out of style, and some unfit to wear. At length she found one which had long been thrown aside as "too light to wear about the house." It was a nice French print, rose coloured and white, and she remembered it had once been a favourite with her husband. The old adage, "fashions come round once in seven years," seemed true in this case; for the dress was made in the then prevailing style.

"This is just the thing," she thought, and she hastened to perform her toilette, saying to herself, "I must alter my dark gingham to wear mornings, and get it all ready before Charles comes home." Then she released her long, dark hair from its imprisonment, in a most ungraceful twist, and carefully brushing its still glossy waves, she plaited it in the broad braids which Charles used so much to admire in the days of her girlhood.

The unwonted task brought back many reminiscences of those long-vanished years, and tears glistened in her eyes as she thought of the many changes time had wrought in those she loved, but she murmured, "What hath sadness like the change that in ourselves we find?" In that hour she realised how an apparently trivial fault had gained the mastery over her, and imperceptibly placed a barrier between her and the one she loved best on earth. True, he never chided her—apparently never noticed her unaltered appearance—but she well knew he no longer urged her going into society, nor did he seem to care about receiving his friends in his own house, although he was a social man, and had once felt proud to introduce his young wife to a large circle of acquaintance.

Now they seldom went out together, excepting to church, and even dressing for that was generally too much of an effort for Mrs. Thornton. She would stay at home to "keep house," after preparing the little ones to accompany their father, and neighbours ceased expecting to meet her at public worship, or in their social gatherings—and so, one by one, they neglected to call on her, until but few of the number continued to exchange friendly greetings with her. She had wondered at this, had felt mortified and pained heretofore; now she clearly saw it was her own fault; the veil was removed from her eyes, and the mistake of her life was revealed in its true enormity. Sincerely did she repent of her past error, and calmly and seriously resolve on future immediate amendment.

Meanwhile her hands were not idle, and at length the metamorphose was complete. The bright pink drapery hung gracefully about her form, imparting an unusual brilliancy to her complexion. Her best wrought collar was fastened with a costly brooch, her husband's wedding gift, which had not seen the light for many a day. Glancing once more at her mirror, to be certain her toilette needed no more finishing touches, she took her sewing and returned to the sitting room.

Little Nellie had wearied of her picture-book, and was now playing with the kitten. As Mrs. Thornton entered, she clapped her hands in childish delight, exclaiming, "Oh, Ma, how pretty—pretty!" and running to her, kissed her again and again, then drew her little chair close to her side and eagerly watched her as she plied her needle, repairing the gingham dress.

Just before it was completed, Nellie's brothers came from school, and pausing at the half-opened door, Willie whispered to Charlie, "I'll bet we've got company, for mother's all dressed up."

It was with mingled emotions of pleasure and pain that Mrs. Thornton ob-

served her children were unusually docile and obedient, hastening to perform their accustomed duties without being even reminded of them. Children are natural and unaffected lovers of the beautiful, and their intuitive perceptions will not often suffer from comparison with the opinions of mature worldly wisdom. It was with a new feeling of admiration that these children now looked upon their mother, and seemed to consider it a privilege to do something for her. It was "Let me light the kindlings," "I will make the fire," and "May I fill the tea-kettle?"—instead of, as it was sometimes the case, "Need I do it?"—"I don't want to,"—"Why can't Willie?"

At last the clock struck the hour when Mr. Thornton was expected, and his wife proceeded to lay the table with unusual care, and to place thereon several choice viands of which she knew he was particularly fond.

Meanwhile let us form the acquaintance of the absent husband and father, whom we find in the neighbouring town, just completing his day's traffic. He is a fine looking, middle-aged man, with an unmistakable twinkle of kindly feeling in his eye, and the line of good humour plainly traced about his mouth—we know at a glance that he is cheerful and indulgent in his family, and are at once prepossessed in his favour.

As he is leaving where he has made his last purchase, he is accosted in a familiar manner by a tall gentleman just entering the door. He recognizes an old friend and exclaims—"George Morton, is it you?" The greeting is mutually cordial; they were friends in boyhood and early youth, but since Mr. Morton has been practising law in a distant city, they have seldom met, and this is no place to exchange their many questions and answers. It needs but little persuasion to induce Mr. Morton to accompany his friend to his home, which he has never yet visited. The conversation is lively and spirited — they recall the feats of their school days, and the experiences of after life, and compare their present position in the world with the golden future of which they used to dream. Mr. Morton is a bachelor, and very fastidious in his tastes —as that class of individuals are prone to be. The recollection of this fact flashes on Mr. Thornton's mind as they drove along toward their destination. At once his zeal in the dialogue abates, he becomes thoughtful and silent, and does not urge his friend onward, but seems willing to afford Mr. Morton an opportunity to admire the beautiful scenery on either hand—the hills and valleys clad in the fresh verdure of June, while the lofty mountain ranges looked blue and dim in the distance. He cannot help wondering if they will find his wife in the same sorry predicament in which he left her that morning, and involuntarily shrinks from introducing so slatternly a personage to his refined and cultivated friend.

But it is now too late to retract his polite invitation—they are nearing the "old homestead;" one field more and his fertile farm, with his well kept fences, appears in view. Yonder is his neat white house, surrounded with elms and maples. They drive through the large gateway, the man John comes from the barn to put out the horses, and Mr. Thornton hurries up the walk to the piazza, leaving his friend to follow at his leisure—he *must* see his wife first, and if possible hurry her out of sight before his visitor enters. He rushes into the sitting room—words cannot express his amazement—there sits the very image of his lovely bride, and a self-conscious blush mantles her cheeks as he stoops to kiss her, with the words of joyful surprise—"*Why*, Ellen!" He has time for no more, George Morton has followed him, and he exclaims, "Ha! Charley, as lover-like as ever; hasn't the honey-moon set yet?" and then he was duly presented to Mrs. Thornton, who, under the pleasing excitement of the occasion, appeared to far better advantage than usual. Tea is soon upon the table, and the gentlemen do ample justice to the repast set before them. A happy meal it is to Charles Thornton, who gazes with admiring fondness on his beautiful wife. Supper over, Mr. Morton coaxes little Nellie to sit in his lap, but she soon slides down, and climbing her father's knee, whispers confidingly, "Don't Mamma look pretty?" He kisses her and answers, "Yes, my darling."

The evening passed pleasantly and

swiftly away, and many a half-forgotten mile of their life's pilgrimage is recalled by some way-mark which still gleams bright in the distance. They both feel younger and better for their interview, and determined never to become like strangers again. Mr. Morton's soliloquy as he retires to the cosy apartment appropriated to his use, is—"Well, this is a happy family! What a lucky fellow Charley is—such a handsome wife and children—and she so good a housekeeper too! May be I'll settle down some day myself," which pleasing idea that night mingled with his visions.

The next morning Mr. Thornton watched his wife's movement with some anxiety—he could not bear to have her destroy the favourable impression which he was certain she had made on his friend's mind, and yet some irresistible impulse forbade him offering any suggestion, or alluding in any way to the delicate subject so long unmentioned between them. But Mrs. Thornton needed no friendly advice; with true womanly tact she perceived the advantage she had gained, and was not at all inclined to relinquish it. The dark gingham dress, linen collar, and snowy apron, formed an appropriate and becoming morning attire for a housekeeper; and the table afforded the guest no occasion for altering his opinion in regard to the skill and affability of his amiable hostess. Early in the morning, Mr. Morton took leave of his hospitable friends, being called away by pressing affairs of business.

Mr. and Mrs. Thornton returned to their accustomed avocations, but it was with renewed energy, and new sense of quiet happiness, no less deeply felt because unexpressed. A day or two afterwards Mr. Thornton invited his wife to accompany him to town, saying he thought she might like to do some shopping, and she with no apparent surprise, but with heartfelt pleasure, acceded to the proposal. The following Sunday the village gossips had ample food for their hungry eyes (to be digested at the next Sewing Society), in the appearance of Mrs. Thornton at Church, clad in plain but rich costume, an entire new outfit, which they could not deny "made her look ten years younger."

This was the beginning of the reform, and it was the dawning of a brighter day for the husband and wife of our story. True, habits of such long standing are not conquered in a week or a month; and very often was Mrs. Thornton tempted to yield to their long tolerated sway, but she fought valiantly against their influence, and in time she vanquished them. An air of taste and elegance pervaded their dwelling, and year after year the links of affection which united them as a family, grew brighter and purer, ever radiating the holy light of a Christian home.

But it was not until many years had passed away, and our little Nellie, now a lovely maiden, was about to resign her place as pet in her father's household, and assume a new dignity, in another's home, that her mother imparted to her the story of her own early errors, and earnestly warned her to beware of that insidious foe to domestic happiness—*disregard of little things*,—and kissing her daughter with a maternal pride and fondness, she thanked her for those simple, child-like words which changed the whole current of her destiny—"*Don't Papa like to see you look pretty?*"

PURE LOVE.

"My God, I love Thee, not because
I hope for heaven thereby;
Not because they who love Thee not
Must burn eternally.

"Thou, O my Jesus, Thou didst me
Upon the cross embrace;
For me didst bear the nails and spear,
And manifold disgrace;

"And griefs and torments numberless;
And sweat of agony;
E'en death itself—and all for one
Who was Thine enemy.

"Then why, O blessed Jesus Christ!
Should I not love Thee well;
Not for the sake of winning Heaven,
Or of escaping hell:

"Not with the hope of gaining aught;
Not seeking a reward:
But, as Thyself hast loved me,
O ever-loving Lord!

"E'en so I love Thee, and will love,
And in Thy praise will sing;
Solely because Thou art my Lord
And my eternal King."

St. Francis Xavier.

TEN THINGS WORTH KNOWING.

I *know*—that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.—Job xix. 25, 26.

We *know*—that all things work together for good to them that love God.—Rom. viii. 28.

I *know*—in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.—1 Tim. i. 13.

We *know*—that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.—2 Cor. v. 1.

We *know*—that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.—1 John iii. 2.

We *know*—that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.—John iv. 42.

If any man will do his will, he shall *know* of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.—John vii. 17.

We *know*—that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.—1 John iii. 14.

We *know*—that whosoever is born of God sinneth not, but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.—1 John v. 18.

By this shall all men *know* that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.—John xiii. 35.

THE USE OF MIRACLES.

In the infancy of the world, signs and wonders were requisite in order to startle and break down that superstition, idolatrous in itself, and the source of all idolatry, which tempts the natural man to seek the true cause and origin of public calamities in outward circumstances, persons, and incidents: in agents, therefore, that were themselves but surges of the same tide, passive conductors of the one invisible influence, under which the whole total host of billows, in the whole line of successive impulse, swell and roll shoreward; there finally, each in its turn, to strike, roar, and be dissipated.

But with each miracle worked there was a *truth* revealed, which was thenceforward to act as its substitute. And if we think the Bible less applicable to us on account of the miracles, we degrade ourselves into mere slaves of sense and fancy, which are indeed the appointed medium between earth and heaven, but for that very cause stand in a desirable relation to spiritual truth then only, when, as a mere and passive medium, they yield a free passage to its light. *It was only to overthrow the usurpation exercised in and through the senses, that the senses* were miraculously appealed to. *Reason and religion are their own evidence.* The natural sun in this respect is a symbol of the spiritual. Ere he is fully arisen, and while his glories are still under veil, he calls up the breeze to chase away the usurping vapours of the night season, and thus converts the air itself into the minister of its own purification, not surely in proof or elucidation of the light from heaven, but to prevent its interception.—*Statesman's Manual.*

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

SIX LECTURES, by Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A., on the Scriptural Doctrine of Reconciliation or Atonement, and connected subjects—containing strictures on "The Atonement; its relation to pardon: an Argument and a Defence, by the Rev. E. Mellor, M.A."—Price 1s. 6d. Whitfield, London.

THE WHOLE DOCTRINE OF CALVIN about the Sabbath and the Lord's Day: extracted from his Commentaries, Catechism, and Institutes of the Christian religion. By Robt. Cox, F.S.A., Scotland. *With an appendix*, containing the opinions of Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Beza, Cranmer, and Knox.—Price 1s 6d. Simpkin, Marshall & Co., London.

DOCTRINAL DECLARATION by the Conference of the Evangelical Union.—Price 3d. Ward & Co., London. As this is a Manifesto Declaration of the distinct views of the Evangelical Union, our readers may wish to know the doctrinal basis of the Union, which is stated in sixteen articles: 1. Free will; 2. Divine Sovereignty; 3. Divine foreknowledge and ordination; 4. Original sin; 5. Unity of the Godhead, in the remedial plan; 6. The nature and extent of the love of God the Father; 7. The nature and extent of the Atonement of the Son; 8. The nature and extent of the work of the Holy Spirit; 9. Concurrence of the divine and human agencies in the matter of salvation. 10. Human ability and inability; 11. Repentance and faith; 12. Relations of prayer and faith; 13. Justification by faith; 14. Peace with God; 15. Regeneration; 16. Election and reprobation. We fear our readers will very imperfectly understand the meaning attached to some of those dogmas. In proof, we will refer to the last article, in which it is said: "On the subject of reprobation, we hold the attribution to that God whose name is love, of an absolute and unconditional decree of reprobation to be the climax of blasphemy." We are sorry the same liberal construction is not put upon every article. Unitarians are still excluded from this Union.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT. A Sermon delivered by the Rev. Thos. Carter, at Westgate Chapel, Lewes, in reply to the discourse of the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, on the "Suffering Saviour," preached at Lewes.—Price 4d. Whitfield, London.

EXPLANATIONS OF SCRIPTURAL TEXTS ADVANCED TO SUSTAIN UNSCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES.

FALLEN ANGELS, DEMONIACS, AND DEVILS.

THE rejection of the popular notions about fallen angels and devils does not necessarily belong to the adoption of Unitarian christianity; but as Unitarians, in general, hold a very different view on the subject of devils from the members of Trinitarian churches, we will devote a few columns explanatory of those passages adduced in support of the popular notions of the doctrine of devils. The most common theory touching the origin of devils is that of

FALLEN ANGELS;

and as there are only a few texts that seem to afford any proof, or are used as proof texts, we will quote them all, and our readers will see how utterly devoid of Bible proof is such a theory.

1st.—"How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations. For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend unto Heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God."—Isaiah xiv. 12, 13.

This is the grand proof text about the devil *aspiring* to sit upon the throne of heaven, and for his *ambition* he is thrust down to hell. We aver that there is not one jot of information in this passage, or the chapter it is taken from, about Satan. Read the whole chapter, and you will find that it is written against Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. We feel certain that ninety-nine out of every hundred who read this chapter through will agree with us. The fourth verse states it is against the king of Babylon, the passage quoted says, "which did weaken the nations;" the sixteenth verse says of him, "is this the man that made the earth to tremble." *Dr. A. Clarke* affirms, "the truth is, the text speaks nothing at all concerning Satan or his fall." Here the corner stone of demonology is completely taken away. There is not one tittle of evidence for it in this famous passage.

2nd.—"And Jesus said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."—Luke x. 18.

The word Satan is of Hebrew origin, and signifies, according to all scholars, an opposer, an enemy, or adversary. It has no reference to personality, but to character or relation. Hence, in the Scriptures, it is employed to describe the evils and opposition which were arrayed against Christ and his doctrines. The term was applied to Peter. But it only described the relation of Peter to his Master. He opposed the Saviour when he told him what a sad fate awaited him. Peter declared it should not be so. In this, and in the subsequent denial of him, he showed himself an adversary, or Satan. Jesus had sent out seventy, and on their return they told him that they had power over devils and unclean spirits, through his name. He then told them that he had seen Satan fall like lightning from heaven. The comparison has reference to the suddenness of the fall, and not to the place from which he fell. He fell, *not from heaven*, but like lightning from heaven. That is, he saw that all adversaries were cast down suddenly. Evils are personified, and Satan may be said to be but a personification of all that were arrayed against Jesus and his followers. In the same chapter, Capernaum is represented as being exalted to heaven. For the city was on a hill, and the phrase, "exalted to heaven," has reference to its social or moral condition. It was proud, and wicked, and it was to be cast down. Its condition was to be greatly changed. Admit that Satan, a rebel angel, did really fall from heaven. What then must we infer of necessity? He fell from heaven. How came Satan in heaven? He must have been the same there as when he landed below. Did he get into heaven, or did he originate there? How many times has he fallen? for there are various periods fixed as the time of a revolt in heaven. If Satan climbed into heaven, other Satans may do the same. If he originated there, other rebels may also originate there. If he was once an angel of light, and while in heaven became evil, other good angels may fall also. Heaven then cannot be much more congenial to virtue than earth, for fallen angels are not indigenous to our planet. Such depravity originates, according to popular theology, in celestial climes. Besides, what assurance can we have of safety and purity, when we reach the celestial shores and blissful abodes? The theory is *unscriptural* and *irrational*.

3rd.—"For if God spared not the *angels* that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."—2 Peter ii. 4. — 4th. "And the *angels* which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."—Jude 6.

In examining these texts of Scripture we need bear in mind that Peter and Jude had both been speaking of *apostate Christians*, who had endangered the peace and purity of the Christian church by false doctrines, and that they pass directly from speaking of these to speak of the "angels that sinned, and which kept not their first estate,"—referring, as *Dr. Adam Clarke* testifies, to the fact "that they were discontented with their position, and kept not their own principality, but invaded the office of others." But who were these angels? We do not find any allusion to them in any other part of the Bible. It appears from ancient history that the first officers in the Christian assemblies were called Presbyters. But when these assemblies became more numerous, and increased in numbers, it became necessary to

add to these. The person thus added was appointed to preside and direct the Presbyters, what to do and how to act. The person thus advanced to the presidency, says *Dr. Mosheim*, was at first distinguished by the title of *the* ANGEL *of his church;* but in after times it became customary to call him the "Bishop." See *Mosheim's* History, vol. i. sec. 41. *Dr. Mosheim* also conjectures that there were good reasons for changing the names of these officers from "the Angel" to "the Bishop." He says:—"As the term, however, could not be deemed free from ambiguity, and might perhaps, be found to give occasion for some aspiring individuals to overrate their own consequence, and fancy themselves nearly on a level with those who are, in the strict sense of the word, styled angels (for the merest trifles are sufficient to supply men with arguments for vanity and pride), it was probably thought better to change the name for one more definite and humble." And this seems to have been the way that the *apostate angels* sinned.—They were discontented with their position, and kept not their principality or place, but invaded the office of others. And the testimony of *Dr. Mosheim* is confirmed by the testimony of the apostle John, for we find by referring to the second and third chapters of Revelation, that he was directed to write to the *Angels* of the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea. And nearly all commentators agree that these "Angels" were nothing more nor less than "the Bishops" of the churches referred to. So that it is clearly proven by Scripture usage, as well as by ecclesiastical history, that "the Bishops" were called "Angels" in the early age of the church. These "Angels" kept not their place or position in the Church, but left their office; and in consequence of their apostacy, they were "delivered into chains of darkness." "Reserved in everlasting chains under darkness," to be destroyed with the unbelieving Jews. The "chains of darkness" into which they are said to have been delivered, indicate very clearly what their moral condition was, for darkness, bondage, and corruption are emblems frequently used by the inspired writers to describe a vicious life. And the Bible abounds with passages which show the gross moral darkness of the world in sin and ignorance. Those *Angels of the Church* had been taken from this gross darkness and brought into marvellous light of the Gospel—they were raised to positions of importance and honour; but they kept not their estate, but wandered away from their position into darkness of heathenism and unbelief, — and "their last state was worse than their first:" and the destruction which awaited them might appropriately be likened to the destruction of Sodom and the cities of the plains. The evidence for the existence of fallen angels is merely in the assumption. The difficulties and objections are manifold. There are only four passages in the scripture ever used as scripture proofs; and the first refers to Nebuchadnezzar, the second to the fall of Judaism and Paganism, and the other two to apostate christians or the first bishops who were called angels. There are some commentators affirm that the reference to fallen angels in Jude, from the context of the passage, has its meaning in the fall of some of the leading men that came out of Egypt with the children of Israel. That it is true of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. It is also worthy of note that the passage in Peter occurs in connection with events in Old Testament history of judgments. Neither Jude nor Peter have any reference, we think, to the popular theory of fallen angels. How many good christian men have had their union with the church severed for disbelief in the doctrine of fallen angels, as if the bible bore full proof of it, whereas there is not one text—no, not one.

SATAN, DEMON, AND DEVIL.

In various parts of the New Testament Christ is represented as casting out devils; these accounts have very much perplexed the readers of the Gospels, and contributed not a little to the belief that there is abroad among the children of men, a host of evil spirits under one common head—*the* devil. The following notes, for which we are indebted to several authors on this topic of demonology, will aid the better understanding of this subject.

"It is a singular fact," says *Dr. Cogan*, "that though the New Testament seems to intimate a belief in the existence of malignant spirits, there is no instance of the practical influence of the creed. There are no supplications to the true God for protection against them." We are inclined to regard the faith in devils that offers itself continually in prayers now for protection against them, as very different from the faith of the first disciples. The highly figurative and allegorical style of the bible, leads us to think that the words *Devil* and *Satan* are to be understood not in a literal, but figurative sense. The fall of Adam refers to a Serpent—temptation. There is not a particle of evedience in the account of a personal devil. The whole, we believe, is allegorical; and the same judgment is formed of the book of Job, with Satan as a tempter and accuser, by divines of all Churches. We see nothing to alter our belief that the Saviour's temptations by the devil, are to be understood otherwise than an allegory in the gospel; for it is impossible that the account can be literally true of the subjects affirmed in the narrative of his temptations. In fact, in all the places in which these words occur, taking into account the parabolical form of instruction that runs through the bible, there is not the least necessity to believe, as many Churches now believe, in an almost omnipotent and omnipresent personal devil. Christ says to his disciples, "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? (diabolos.) An accuser, traitor, adversary, we may abundantly see in the scriptures, is spoken of as a devil or satan; and peculiar temptations or trials, or great forms of opposition to the diffusion of gospel truth, or the instigation to a course of sinful life is called the devil. Thus, throughout the bible, and more particularly in the book of Revelation, is this form of speech continually used. We feel sure that every text is capable of

an easy and rational explication upon this view of the subject. Whereas the belief in a personal devil is crowded with difficulties.

The word *Satan*, used in the scripture, signifies nothing more than an *adversary;* and it is also used in a good sense, as well as an evil one, in many places of the original of the scripture. The angel of God, sent against Balaam, is called "*Satan*," and in numerous instances is this the case, though the general meaning is an evil adversary, as Peter was called Satan by Christ. It by no means signifies one in particular, adversary of the human family, as it is popularly understood in the present day. Its popular use is foreign to its scriptural meaning, just as the word devil, or devils, in the common translation of the gospels, convey a very wrong idea now to that intended in the original use of the word demon. In the thirteen epistles of Paul, the word Satan means, Rom. xvi. 20, the persecutors of the Roman converts. 1 Cor. v. 5, excommunication for a time. 1 Cor. vii. 7, the violation of marriage vows. 2 Cor. ii. 11, personal opponent to Paul. 2 Cor. xi. 14, false apostles. 2 Cor. xii. 7, corporeal infirmity. 1 Thess. ii. 18, Jews persecuting Silas and Paul. 2 Thess. ii. 9, Jews again. 1 Tim. i. 20, excommunication. 1 Tim. v. 15, idolatrous indulgences.

The word *devil* or *diabolos*, found in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, may be thus summerised. Five times the term devil is used by Christ—Matt. xiii. 39, where it refers to human enemies of the gospel. Matt. xxv. 41, the Roman power. Luke viii. 12, human enemies of the gospel. John vi. 70, Judas Iscariot. John viii. 44, the incarnation of Jewish malice. By John xiii. 2, the avarice of Judas. By Peter, Acts x. 28, every species of sickness and disease. By Paul, Acts xiii. 10, the opposition of Bar-Jesus to the gospel. The term *devil* is used twelve times in the epistles.—Eph. iv. 27, where it implies a slanderer. Eph. vi. 11, an accuser. 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7, evil speakers. 1 Tim. iii. 11, slanderers. 2 Tim. ii. 26, accuser. 2 Tim. iii. 3, false accusers. Titus ii. 3, false accusers. Heb. ii. 14, heathenism. James iv. 7, pride and revenge. 1 Peter v. 8, false accusers. 1 John iii. 8, 10, where it is synonymous with sin. Jude ix., an opponent to an archangel. Whether we are correct in all those cases or not, it is undeniable that the word "*Satan*" means an adversary; and as *Dr. Bushnell* says, "*Satan*, or the *Devil* taken in the singular, *is not the name of any particular person*, neither is it a personation merely of temptation, or impersonal evil, but *the name is one taken up by the imagination* to designate or embody, in a conception the mind can most easily wield, the all or total of bad minds and powers."

The words *demon*, *demons*, and *demoniac*, mistranslated in our gospel—*devil*, occur in the gospels about seventy times, and refer to persons so possessed; whereas the word *diabolos* or *devil* in no place in the New Testament once refers to such possession. The spirits that were thought to take possession of men's bodies, as found in the gospels, are invariably called *demons*, not *devils*. Nor were the demons of ancient times always regarded as evil spirits, though most generally they were believed to be the spirits of wicked men, who enter the living, or of heathen deities, who had the power of tormenting and killing the inhabitants of the earth.

We have no doubt that those persons who supposed themselves to be possessed with devils, in the age of Christ, were insane persons, though the superstitions of the times called them bewitched, or possessed with demons. Because the gospel historians give a correct account of the general impression regarding those persons and their diseases, we have no reason to accept their belief, though we accept the accounts of those maladies, and the miracles that were wrought to deliver them. No one now believes that melancholy, lunacy, insanity, epilipsy, &c., are caused by demons. They are natural disorders, however difficult to explain. During the last two centuries we can cite cases of persons who have affirmed they were possessed with demons; we do not believe their testimony. That there are some difficulties in explaining the gospel account of these possessions, we admit; but the greater difficulties rest with those who believe that devils formerly possessed men and women. It is said the demons spake; it was the person so affected spoke. It is said the devils were cast out; these are but other words for the fact that they were cured of their diseases. The case of greatest difficulty is that where the demons are represented as having requested of Christ, and were allowed, to take possession of a herd of swine. We believe the insane persons thought they were possessed of a number of demons, and Christ showed the perfect cure of them, and his own power, by passing the madness, as they requested, to a herd of swine, who were immediately drowned in the sea. A great amount of property was destroyed in this case: this fact has nothing to do with the argument. We are informed that it was contrary to the laws of the Jews to keep swine there, and it was also contrary to the laws of Hyrcanus. Both laws were broken, and the loss of property was therefore just. A cure of the diseased persons was effected, the fancy of the deranged was also humoured, they saw the swine hurry down the steep into the sea, and no doubt Jesus thus secured them against a return of these morbid fancies. They had seen the cure with their own eyes. This miracle produced a powerful impression upon all the people, and led many to be disciples of Christ. Our readers well know that the kind and skilful physician often suits his words to some fancy of his patient. See the case of the woman who came to Dr. Priestley to be cured of a devil (page 117 of this number.) The miracle might serve to remove the popular superstition, when they saw an animal affected, as they supposed. The account has its difficulties; so have many other things in which we daily believe.

The most popular argument for real possession is drawn from the language of Christ and the first Apostles. The historians say, "They brought unto him those that were possessed with demons, and that Jesus rebuked the demons, and commanded them to come out." And that the ejection of demons is distinguished from the curing of diseases. We reply, our Saviour and

his Apostles might or might not believe in real possession; it is not clear that Christ did so from using the popular language of the day, which was in use before he came into the world, founded on the supposition of real possession.—*Farmer*, in his work on demoniacs, puts the case very well. He says, "It is customary with all sorts of persons to speak on subjects in the language of the common people. We call a distemper—*lunacy*, without enquiring what influence the moon has upon it. We speak of St. Anthony's fire and St. Vitus's dance; it would be very wrong of a future generation to believe that *we* acknowledge the influence of these saints, though some people may do so still." So we could enumerate forms of speech we employ, grounded in error, yet we use the form of language every day. The word among the Romans, which originally signified a man actuated by furies (Furiosus), afterwards denoted any madman. The Jews expressed different disorders by different demons. They did this, as Josephus does, in the age of the gospel, when he expressly referred the madness to a different cause than the possession of demons. Jews and heathens adopted the common phraseology when they did not design to countenance the opinions in which it was founded; and so might Christ and his Apostles. When Christ says, "Come out thou unclean spirit, &c.," we no more infer he believed in the personality of such spirits, than when we hear him reasoning about Beelzebub or Mammon that he believed in the personality of those heathen gods. When we read of Christ speaking to the winds and the sea, or rebuking a fever, we do not infer his belief in their conscious personality. If the opinion of possession of demons was an error, it may be said that Christ and his Apostles did not correct the error; they did not, we admit,—yet, though the first publishers of the Christian religion did not explain the cause of natural diseases, insanity, &c., &c., they did enough to extinguish the growth of this error, and discredit the power of demons in casting them out. And as we are sure that the doctrine of devils is not founded in revelation, we are equally sure that the Jewish and Christian faith is subversive of such doctrine. When St. Paul says that an idol IS NOTHING IN THE WORLD, we are persuaded he has in view the heathen deities or demons which were supposed to have some influence in the world. Those who like the faith in demons, satans, and devils can enjoy it. It neither makes men morally better, nor more truly pious. It has no proper place or connection with theology. We are persuaded that the more the world is guided by the spirit of the bible, it will believe less in devils, and more in God. "Some persons," says *Richard Wright*, "seem to regard a denial of the existence of the devil as a step toward atheism, and to be nearly as much shocked by it as they would be to hear the being of God questioned. Such persons excite our compassion. Those who deny the existence of the devil only go a step further from atheism than many Christians choose to advance. The denial of any agency in the creation, but what is under the divine superintendence, may be called the extreme point from atheism."

A STORY OF DIABOLICAL POSSESSION.

A LETTER FROM BATES TO BAXTER, 1651.

I WILL relate you a story of a maid in Canterbury, who about nine years since was an eminent instance of God's displeasure, &c. She had promised marriage to one of a mean calling, whom she cast off upon an offer made by another who was better provided in estate. The first, after several endeavours to recover her affections, comes to her at the last, and tells her he was going from her, so as she would never see him more; to which she answered she was glad of it. He then took her by the apron-strings, and shaking them said, 'Bess! God will shake thee.' He, upon this, went from Canterbury to Dover, and was seen once to go towards the sea, but never returned. This maid, living in a little room by herself, had spun some flax, which she carried to her neighbour's, intending to go and sell it in the market. While she was in the house, there being a very small fire, suddenly there was a noisome smell of brimstone, which they marvelled at, but found not apparent cause. The maid takes her basket wherein her flax was, and, opening it, found the flax burned to a coal! This gave so strong a smell that for the space of four hours the whole street was oppressed with it. The next night as this maid lay alone in her bed appears to her the man whom she had promised, with something about his head, as if he were going to drown himself, and asked her whether she would have him. She, shrinking into the bed, he takes hold of her fingers and disjoints all the parts of her fingers, wrist and arm to the shoulder, and takes hold of her toe and plucks all out of joint from thence to her hip. The maid discovers nothing as yet. Another night there appears to her the form of a bull, and with one blow breaks her ribs to pieces. Another time, the form of a dog, and tore her throat. Another time, a ball was forced down into her stomach, which so inflamed her that she could no more be touched than burning coals. So that with anguish one of her eyes dropt out. The devil told her that her case was desperate, and bid her seek no help by ministers. But the Lord in his rich mercy prevailed upon her to open her condition to them, who by fasting and prayer obtained mercy for her. She was eminently broken in heart, freed from those dreadful effects of God's anger, and became an humble, holy Christian. She is still alive, and for these eight years not able to move out of bed, only as lifted in a sheet.

That you may be assured of the truth of this story, know that I received it from one of the ministers who then lived in Canterbury, who was with her, and put his hand into her side where her ribs were broken. It is most worthy to be communicated to the world in this unbelieving age.

The good Lord direct and prosper you in that work which he gives you to do, and to express myself in the verse of an excellent man,

"Go you to heav'n, but yet do make no haste,
Go slowly, slowly, but yet go at last."

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

MATHEMATICAL IDEA OF HONOR.—A graduate of a certain college gave another the lie, and a challenge followed. The mathematical tutor of the college heard of the dispute, and sent for the youth, who told him he must fight. "Why?" inquired the mathematician. "He gave me the lie." "Very well—let him prove it. If he proves it, you did lie; and if he does not prove it, he lies. Why should you shoot one another? Let him prove it."

PROFANE LANGUAGE.—It is related by Dr. Scudder that, on his return from his mission in India, after a long absence, he was standing on the deck of a steamer with his son, a youth, when he heard a gentleman using profane language. "See, friend," said the doctor, accosting the swearer, "this boy, my son, was born and brought up in a heathen country, and a land of pagan idolatry; but in all his life he never heard a man blaspheme his Maker until now." The man coloured, blurted out an apology, and looked not a little ashamed of himself.

A GOOD CHRISTIAN.—He is a good Christian who comes frequently to Church; who presents the oblation that is offered to God upon the altar; who doth not taste the fruits of his own industry until he has consecrated a part of them to God. Redeem then your souls from destruction, while you have the means in your power; offer presents and tithes to Churchmen; for if you observe these things you may come with security in the day of retribution to the tribunal of the eternal Judge, and say, "Give us, O Lord, for we have given unto thee."—*Charge of the Bishop of Limoges, 7th Century.*

THE EFFECTS OF DRINK.—John D. Defrees, writing to the *Indianapolis Journal*, says, "Twenty years ago I was a looker-on at the doings of Congress. The two men who attracted most attention were William Cost Johnson, of Maryland, and Thomas F. Marshall, of Kentucky. They were the most brilliant orators — the 'observed of all observers.' Mr. Johnson died in Maryland a few days ago, a pauper and an outcast, unnoticed and unlamented. The papers, a few days ago, informed us that Marshall is an inmate of a hospital at Buffalo, diseased and miserable, and about to die. Intemperance, of course, is the cause of all this."

FEELING FOR THE PILLARS.—When Luther was at Coburg, he wrote to a friend, "I was lately looking out of my window at night, and I saw the stars in the heavens, and God's great beautiful arch over my head, but I could not see any pillars on which the great builder had fixed his arch; and yet the heavens fell not, and the great arch stood firmly. There are some who are always feeling for the pillars, and longing to touch them, they stand trembling and fearing lest the heavens should fall. If they could only grasp the pillars, then the heavens would stand fast." Thus Luther illustrated the faith of his own soul, and wished to inspire others with the same strong confidence.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.—"If Ministers had forgotten the memorable warning of Lord Holland, they have been reminded of it several times since that warning was uttered—on occasion of the debate of the Dissenters' Chapel Bill. 'If you take my advice,' said Lord Holland, 'you will be very careful how you decide in opposition to the Unitarians on any question of religious liberty. They understand those matters thoroughly. I have had to do with them for a long course of years, and I never yet differed from them on any question of religious liberty without finding myself in the wrong.' This is easily accounted for; so easily that the wonder is that any statesman can make light of questions which are shown by our national history to be so profoundly serious to such a body of men as the English Nonconformists."—*Daily News.*

WORK AND WORSHIP.—A pious monk, one day when he had been unusually fervent in his devotions, found his darkened cell suddenly illuminated by an unearthly light, and there stood before him a vision of the Saviour, his countenance beaming with God-like love, his hand outstretched with a gesture of kind invitation. At that moment rang the convent bell, which called the monk, in the regular course of his duty, to distribute alms to the poor at the gate. For an instant he hesitated; but the next moment found him, true to his vow of charity, on his way to the gate. The poor relieved, the work of love complete, he returned in sadness to his cell, doubting not that the beatific vision had taken flight. But to his surprise and joy it was still there, with a smile even more full than before of divine beauty and ineffable love; and there came from it the words, "Hadst thou stayed I had fled."—*Catholic Legend.*

MARTYR TO A PRINCIPLE.—Dr. Wentworth writes thus from Fuh Chau, China: "The heathen have no Sabbath. Christian nations are the only ones that keep the Christian Sabbath. Sunday in China is just like any other day. The natives think it very queer that we 'rest' one day in seven, and they say they should starve if they did it. We ask them to compare themselves with those who rest on the Lord's day, and see who are best housed, best fed, best clothed, those who worship God and obey the fourth commandment, or those who worship idols, and work all the time to keep idols' feast days. When a Chinaman begins to listen to the Gospel, the first thing he does is to put away his idols, and the next to break off labour on the Christian Sabbath. A few months ago a young man, living in the country, became convinced of the truth of Christianity, and ceased to labour on Sunday. His father said, 'Very well, if he won't work on Sunday, he shan't eat on Sunday,' and for weeks the boy has fasted from Saturday night till Monday morning. The Chinese make staunch Christians when once converted."

All Letters, Post Office Orders, &c., to be addressed to ROBERT SPEARS, Stockton-on-Tees.

Printed by W. ROBINSON, High-street, Stockton.